

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

and intelligent discussion about something that will affect Canadian sovereignty?

It took three years for the Government to negotiate this particular agreement. It is now ramming it through Parliament in a dictatorial, Draconian fashion. It has allowed but five days of debate on it. No doubt it will limit debate at committee as well.

We know that the Conservatives, led by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), want to go into an election campaign to talk about what they have accomplished. They think that the people of Canada will give them lollies for having passed and endorsed the free trade agreement here in the House of Commons. We say to the Minister for International trade that if he is so confident the agreement is so positive, and if he is so confident it is in the best interests of Canada, then why rush it? Why not go to the people in a general election? We will debate the Minister in any riding in Canada on any political platform during an election campaign. Let us be given the opportunity to present our side of the story, and the Minister can present his limited side of the story.

The Government is afraid. If the Minister took the time to read this particular agreement he would notice a few interesting facts. In Clause 2 it is interesting to note that those who drafted this particular agreement defined "United States". What is the United States? We all know the United States to be a country, a large country to the south of us, but for some reason it was important to include a definition of it in the Bill. I do not know what motives the Minister had in instructing the drafters of this legislation to define the United States, but it is defined as follows:

- (a) the customs territory of the United States, including the fifty states of the United States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico,
- (b) the foreign trade zones located in the United States and Puerto Rico, and
- (c) any areas beyond the territorial sea of the United States—

I suppose the Minister wanted to make it absolutely clear that we were not talking about Canada when we are talking about the United States.

No where in this clause is Canada defined. There is no definition of Canada, yet there is a definition of the United States of America.

We see that in Clause 130(9) it was important to define what an American is. Why define what an American is? Why define what the United States is and not define what Canada is? "American" means an individual other than a Canadian who is a national of the United States or is lawfully admitted for permanent residence. I just do not know what the ulterior motives of the Minister were.

I know that the Minister for International Trade can read. I know for a fact that he passed high school. I would ask him simply to take the time to read the agreement. I know that it might be a little complicated for him. He might have had some difficulties when he went to law school, but any lay person

could at least read through the agreement and try to understand it.

I want an opportunity to express my view. You might find it necessary, Madam Speaker, in a few moments to cut me off, but I am not going to sit down voluntarily. I want to make submissions. I have a right as a Member of Parliament to make submissions on the most important issues facing my constituents.

In the last election campaign free trade was not an issue. It was not an issue in the riding of York South—Weston. It was not an issue in Manicouagan. It was not an issue anywhere in the country. This Prime Minister lied to the people of Canada, Madam Speaker, during the last election campaign—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** I must interrupt the Hon. Member. The time at his disposal has now expired.

**Mr. Nunziata:** Madam Speaker, the people of Canada will be given the opportunity to reject that Prime Minister—

**Mr. Crosbie:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member for York South—Weston knows the rules. We know he is only seeking publicity. Nevertheless, he has said that another Member of this House lied. In fact, he referred to the Prime Minister. He should do the proper thing and withdraw that remark.

He should remember this as well. He should remember that truth does not lurk in rat holes.

**Mr. Robichaud:** You should know, John.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** I am sure the Hon. Member will do the honourable thing. The Chair heard him as well.

**Mr. Nunziata:** Madam Speaker, there is another word that rhymes with rat hole, and that is what the Minister is.

The Prime Minister of Canada, the integrity, the honesty, and the credibility of that Prime Minister—

**Some Hon. Members:** Withdraw!

**Mr. Andre:** You are disgusting, Nunziata, do you know that?

**Mr. Rossi:** Superbox Harvie, keep quiet.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** I have not as yet heard the Hon. Member withdraw. I am sure he will do the honourable thing and withdraw the term that was unparliamentary which he used, I know, in the heat of debate at the end of this long day. I am sure the Hon. Member will withdraw.

**Mr. Nunziata:** Madam Speaker, out of deference to the Chair, on occasion I do get carried away, but I did call the Prime Minister of Canada a liar. I know that to call the Prime